



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,200	06/30/2001	Timothy Simon Bartley	AUS9-2001-0247-US1	7570

7590 11/15/2005
Barry S. Newberger
5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75270

EXAMINER

JUNG, DAVID YIUK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/896,200	Applicant(s) BARTLEY, TIMOTHY SIMON	
	Examiner David Y. Jung	Art Unit 2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-28 are presented.

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26, 28 are rejected over Pinkert (Pinkert and Wear, Operating Systems, Concepts, Policies, and Mechanisms, Prentice Hall, 1989, pgs 4, 205-207)

Claims 9, 18, 27 are rejected over Pinkert and Whitney (
<http://www.eli.sdsu.edu/courses/spring99/cs696/notes/security/security.html>.)

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-26, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinkert (Pinkert and Wear, Operating Systems, Concepts, Policies, and Mechanisms, Prentice Hall, 1989, pgs 4, 205-207).

Regarding claim 1, Pinkert teaches "A security policy method comprising the steps of: associating wildcarded resource identifiers with a corresponding security policy (page 4, the third paragraph, i.e. resource management, guardian); and matching a

Art Unit: 2134

resource identifier received in an access request to one of a list of said wildcarded resource identifiers, wherein said matching is determined in accordance with a predetermined set of precedence values, each precedence value of said set corresponding to a predetermined wildcard element (pages 205-207, i.e. aliases which are a type of wildcarding in the sense that more than one name is used with precedence values).”

These passages of Pinkert do not explicitly teach “policy” in the sense of the claim.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art to keep the consistency of various sets of security techniques within a system at the level of a “policy” which is a logical way of solving a problem, instead of explicitly implementing only one set of security techniques at the level of a mechanism which is an explicit implementation of such a policy – for the motivation of having flexibility in implementation.

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to modify Pinkert for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 2-8 (various identifier handlings), such features are well known in the art for the motivations of convenient naming and of convenient security.

Regarding claims 10-17, 19-26, 28, these claims are analogs of claims 1-8, 1-8, 1, respectively. For the reasons noted in the rejections of claims 1-8, these claims are not patentable.

Claims 9, 18, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinkert and Whitney (

<http://www.eli.sdsu.edu/courses/spring99/cs696/notes/security/security.html>).

Pinkert teaches as noted in the previous rejections.

Whitney suggests "wherein said set of precedence values comprises: a first precedence value having a highest precedence corresponding to an exact character, a second precedence value have a next lower precedence from said first precedence value, corresponding to a character range; a third precedence value, having a next lower precedence from said second precedence value, corresponding to any character; a fourth precedence value, having a next lower precedence from said third precedence values corresponding to a repeating exact character; a fifth precedence value, having a next lower precedence from said fourth precedence value, corresponding to a repeating character range; and a sixth precedence value, having a next lower precedence from said fifth precedence value, corresponding to any character string, and wherein said sixth precedence value comprises a lowest precedence value (slide 10, section on host, i.e. the wildcards being used as a character range for domain name server, the wildcards providing precedence levels as shown in the example given in section on host.)" for the motivation of effectively implementing security (as noted in the front section on security model).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2134

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-3836 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (571) 272-3836 or Greg Morse whose telephone number is (571) 272-3838.

David Jung

Patent Examiner

9/14/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'D' followed by a series of loops and a final upward stroke.